

in any community where Mexicans are subjected to discriminatory practices.

The Labor Department has used this power to act on a number of complaints. In Stamford, Tex., barber shops and beauty parlors were charged with denying service to persons of Mexican ancestry. The complaint was resolved when the mayor agreed to take steps to remedy the problem. In Levelland, Tex., a movie theater refused to admit Mexicans, but the owner changed his policy when he was informed of the sanctions that could be applied under Article 8. In Slaton, Tex., similar intervention by the Department of Labor led to the admission of Mexicans to a hitherto "white only" city swimming pool.

Yet the record does not disclose any outpouring of southern Democratic indignation over alleged infringements of property rights under Public Law 78. On the contrary. Southern legislators have been among the strongest proponents of this measure to provide low-cost labor in rural areas. Are we to conclude that it is perfectly proper to use Federal power to protect the civil rights of foreign nationals—but that it is somehow un-American to protect the rights of citizens of the United States?

#### PROPOSED TEST BAN TREATY

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. EVERETT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the lengthy hearings and the extended debates over the proposed nuclear test ban treaty have clearly demonstrated the wisdom of the administration for having negotiated it.

Certainly, reasonable men can disagree, and those opposed to the treaty are not to be castigated simply because they are opposed. But in this case the opposition has resorted to one weightless argument after another. For example, some critics have argued that the Soviet Union has surpassed the United States in the area of high yield nuclear explosives and that since the treaty prohibits atmospheric testing we can never catch up. Yet Dr. Teller himself has rejected this argument and has testified that he does not regard the high yield weapons that the Russians have developed as particularly significant, and that they do not bear importantly upon security considerations.

They have argued that the treaty was written in the Soviet Union and that it is being dictated to us. But the truth is that it is almost the same treaty that we have been urging for years and that we wrote the draft of the treaty.

They have argued that this treaty is an act of unilateral disarmament. How a bilateral agreement can be construed as a unilateral act of any nature is concept beyond my understanding. It is a contradiction. In fact President Eisenhower said on August 22, 1958:

As the United States has frequently made clear, the suspension of testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons is not, in itself, a measure of disarmament or a limitation of armament. An agreement in this respect is significant if it leads to other and more substantial agreements relating to limitations and reduction of fissionable material for weapons and to other essential phases of disarmament. It is in this hope that the United States makes this proposal.

Perhaps the most dangerous of the arguments presented is the insincere one whereby an amendment relating to Cuba would be tacked on to the treaty in the Senate. The proponent of this amendment admits that it involves a side issue not contemplated by the treaty. Further, he admits that even if the amendment were adopted, the treaty would still not be acceptable to him. This is hypocrisy and I submit not worthy of being presented in such an august and deliberative body as the U.S. Senate.

The critics have also argued that we need more time within which to bargain with the Soviet Union. But time is of the essence. It is short. It is the stuff that is running out on the radioactive clocks of the world. Time should be utilized for constructive purposes, not wasted.

The purpose of the treaty is to stop the testing of nuclear explosives so as to put a halt to the further contamination of the atmosphere with radioactivity. The babies of the world, living and unborn, cannot afford to absorb any more radioactivity. The level of strontium 90 has already reached frightening proportions in certain parts of our country.

The President has said that the treaty represents a small step toward world peace. How, in good conscience, can any reasonable person refuse to take it?

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. EVERETT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### U.S. STUDENTS WHO TRAVELED TO CUBA, AFTER CAUSING NEAR RIOTS ON CAPITOL HILL, PRACTICE OPPRESSION

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I attended and was shocked over the well-planned efforts to create havoc and, hopefully, thus to downgrade the Congress by the U.S. students who traveled to Cuba which occurred in Washington last week at the time of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings.

These outbreaks, in direct violation of committee rules, and exhibiting no respect whatsoever for Government, were done in the name of so-called freedoms which the students were asserting, including the claimed right to violate any laws with which they disagreed.

It is interesting to note how this obviously Communist inspired and well-in-doctrinated group, which aided the Communist efforts by visiting Cuba in violation of U.S. laws, have carried out the Communist design while in Washington and are continuing to carry out that design in New York at their meeting to protest the travel ban to Cuba by completely reversing their position—a trick

not uncommon to the Communist strategy—and practicing most oppressive actions which violated the rights of all those who protested this meeting.

The actions were directed toward two anti-Castro groups who oppose Castro and who are in favor of retaining the travel ban. Such oppressive measures invoked by these U.S. student travelers to Cuba and their sponsoring organizations included:

First. Inspection and frisking of all persons attending.

Second. Demanding that all anti-Castro sympathizers leave despite the fact that they had paid for admission to what was advertised as a public meeting.

Third. Physical expulsion of anti-Castro sympathizers even though they had caused no disturbance.

Fourth. Actual physical violence and physical force used to kick out anti-Castro sympathizers, resulting in personal injury and the letting of blood.

Fifth. Refusal to let any opponents of the pro-Castro rally to speak or be heard.

This action by the pro-Castro student group puts in proper focus and makes a mockery out of their protests over being denied what they claimed were their rights before the House Un-American Activities Committee and indicates they believe they have a right to demonstrate, even before a duly constituted congressional committee, but that people who oppose their views have no right to even attend a meeting or to be heard at a meeting sponsored by their group and, further, that actual force to remove any such persons is justified.

This is typical of the Communist conspiracy philosophy which is—demand all sorts of rights and privileges in order to accomplish the Communist objective and deny all such rights to those who oppose you.

I wish to insert in the Record at this point, for my colleagues' attention, an article on this matter which appeared in the New York Times of September 16. The article follows:

THOUSANDS OF EXILES MASS NEAR TOWN HALL  
TO ASSAIL GROUP PROTESTING TRAVEL BAN  
TO CUBA—FIVE ARE ARRESTED

(By Peter Kihss)

Thousands of anti-Castro demonstrators swarmed in and around the Times Square area yesterday protesting a Town Hall rally by American students who had traveled to Cuba.

The rally, from which two groups of anti-Castro demonstrators were forcibly ejected, wound up with the police escorting 1,400 participants in the meeting along 43d Street to the Times Square subway station.

One anti-Castro Cuban was cut above the eye; five persons were arrested in scuffles waged at various points in the area; a police inspector and a newspaper reporter were hit by an egg, and a police horse was gashed when thrust against a car.

But the meeting went off as scheduled from 2:15 to 4:45 p.m. Phillip Abbott Luce, one of the leaders, said the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba would sponsor another trip to Cuba—perhaps next January or June—to uphold its claim to freedom of travel, despite a State Department ban.

REPRESSION CHARGED

At the rally, Conrad J. Lynn, panel moderator, asserted that "we are making a

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16133

me, has picked a rather unusual occasion to bring out his newest crying towel. We in New England view the oncoming winter season with much apprehension. We are informed that the quotas on residual fuel which we are to be allowed to burn in our schools, hospitals, powerplants, apartments, and industrial buildings are inadequate to carry us through the winter.

## BAD WINTER—BAD NEWS

In fact, if we have a particularly severe winter, as we did last winter, we will face a severe shortage. We realize that through Mr. Moody's very effective lobbying, the lifeblood of our economy is threatened. We know that, at best, even if the Department of Interior—in another magnanimous gesture—gives us a slight increase in our quotas, we will still—once again thanks to Mr. Moody's efforts—have to pay a substantial price premium for the fuel that we burn. Secretary Udall, of course, is familiar with our problem. When he dusted off Passamaquoddy a while ago, he mentioned New England's high electric rates, which the oil quotas help keep up. High rates, high quotas, and high mountains—Mr. Udall has an affinity for all.

## NEW ENGLAND PAYS COAL SUBSIDY

Possibly it has not occurred to Mr. Moody that residual oil quotas are a form of Government subsidy. There is no difference between a Government quota system which raises the price of a vitally needed commodity and a system by which the Federal Government fosters the growth of the atomic power industry with development funds. When New Englanders pay \$30 million a year in increased prices for residual fuel, it is a subsidy to the coal industry—no matter what you call it, it is still a subsidy.

I am forced to conclude, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Moody is well aware of the fact that his industry is being subsidized by the Federal Government by the inequitable means of residual oil quotas. Perhaps it is time we reminded Mr. Moody of the ancient truism that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." It is difficult for me to understand how Mr. Moody can plead for subsidies for his industry in the form of residual oil quotas and at the same time decry subsidies for the development of nuclear power.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have not reached the point wherein the self-interest of one fuel producing industry can block or even retard the genuine progress which our country may experience in exploring the vast and yet unknown potentials of nuclear energy, a potential which can so dramatically benefit all of mankind. I hope also, Mr. Speaker, that we have not reached the point where the self-interest of one fuel producing industry can bring about Government policies which discriminate against and oppress a vital region of our country. The rather shameless display of hypocrisy on the part of the National Coal Policy Conference as evidenced by this appeal, Mr. Speaker, underlines more vividly than ever the need for removal of residual oil quotas.

## STEEL CAPACITY OF THE NATION

(Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, time and time again during the last presidential campaign Candidate Kennedy deplored the fact that the steel capacity of the Nation was not operating at a higher rate.

Although domestic output has seen a slight uptrend over the last 4 weeks, it still remains under 60 percent of industry capacity. Meantime, foreign steel moving into the country hit a record high of 600,000 tons in July, surpassing May's previous mark of 516,000 tons.

It becomes apparent that the trade policies of this administration continue to prevent a higher rate of capacity in steel and, also, contributes to high unemployment.

In this regard, may I point out that in my hometown of Canton and elsewhere in the Nation during that campaign Candidate Kennedy said:

We are going to have to find 25,000 jobs a week for the next 10 years if we are going to find jobs for your children who are coming into the labor market—25,000 jobs a week, 52 weeks a year for 10 years, if we are going to maintain full employment in the United States, and it is going to be a matter that is going to be of concern to us all, Canton, Ohio, and the United States. We want to make sure that any American who seeks a job, who honestly wants to work will have a chance to work. That is our objective.

Glowing promise, but where are the jobs?

I think it is well to ask, Mr. Speaker, when will we have the capacity in steel production that will put our steelworkers back to work? I wonder if the candidate of 1960 who is obviously preparing his campaign for 1964 will have an answer to these questions?

## SYMPATHY FOR BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. EVERETT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in mourning for the four young people of Birmingham, Ala., who fell victims of an act that must be recorded in history as one of the most dastardly and barbarian of our time.

Our sympathy goes out to the parents, relatives, and friends of these young people who are, without question, martyrs in a just cause.

But sympathy is not enough. We must assure that these young people did not die useless deaths.

I am confident our Government will leave nothing unturned in its efforts to place the blame, to cause the person or persons who committed this beastly act to be brought before a court of law and there to answer for their horrible misdeed.

But blame and punishment are not enough. It is a question of responsibility.

It is a question of the moral obligation that failed to protect the lives of these young citizens. If it is beyond the capability of the officials of Alabama to protect its citizens and to guarantee their constitutionally given rights, then I feel, the Negro population has the right to expect the protection of the Federal Government.

We must act to protect our citizens, in the South and elsewhere, to guard against further violence in a State where today fear prevails.

How many children must die? How many families must be grieved before we take the actions necessary to assure that all men may enjoy the full rights of citizenship and live in peace, free from threats and bodily harm.

Sympathy, blame and punishment are not enough, for if we do not act with utmost speed to bring full rights of citizenship to all Americans and to secure domestic peace, the beasts will continue to ravage the just and the lawful, and surely those young Americans will have died in vain.

The Congress has before it legislation that will so guarantee and I urge that we now give highest priority for action to this critical measure.

Again, as we did on August 28, we are witnessing a tremendous demonstration of civic responsibility and good citizenship as the Negro leaders of Alabama and throughout the Nation plead with their justly outraged people to follow the path of law to justice.

It is our hope that all men, in Alabama and elsewhere, will heed that plea.

And as we pray for the souls of the children who lost their lives let us pray also that in the days ahead right and justice will prevail and that all Americans can work and worship in safety and with dignity.

## A SOUTHERN PRECEDENT

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. EVERETT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have previously pointed out the odd and ambivalent attitude of many backers of the bracero law, because they willingly support the antidiscrimination clauses of that law, but do not support similar measures now sponsored by the administration. Today's Washington Post points out this dichotomy:

## A SOUTHERN PRECEDENT

Of all the southern objections to the civil rights bill, one of the weakest is that the public accommodations provisions involve a wholly novel Federal infringement on property rights. It is pertinent to point out that southern legislators themselves have supported a public law that embodies the very philosophy that underlies the public accommodation section of the civil rights bill.

This little-noticed precedent exists in Public Law 78, which governs the importation of Mexican labor for harvest work. Article 8 of the law contains a strong prohibition against discrimination, and empowers the Secretary of Labor to prohibit use of braceros

1963

demonstration here this afternoon not so much for Cuba as for America."

"There will be no peaceful solution to American problems if we are going to have repression of expression," he said.

The Times Square area has been ruled out for mass demonstrations by an order of Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy since last October 24. The ban is from 40th to 59th Street between 5th and 9th Avenues.

But before yesterday's gathering at Town Hall, 113 West 43d Street, between the Avenue of the Americas and 7th Avenue, Cuban exile groups opposed to Premier Fidel Castro had been calling their forces from as far away as Miami and Washington to protest. The American students, the Cuban exiles had heard, planned to make favorable reports on the Castro revolution.

#### TURNOUT ESTIMATED AT 3,000

Alfred Estrada, assistant secretary general of the exiles' Cuban Workers Democratic Revolutionary Front, estimated that up to 3,000 anti-Castro adherents from many groups had turned out.

They ran into a reminder by Assistant Chief Inspector Anthony S. O'Connell, of the anti-picketing ban. But the police official said he would allow 25 pickets on West 43d Street across Town Hall. He suggested the others might disperse to demonstrate at such areas as the United Nations.

Chief O'Connell reported he had more than 100 policemen on hand by 1 p.m. They included mounted policemen wearing World War I helmets. The police screened pedestrians to make sure they had tickets to the rally or business in the block.

By 1:30 p.m. motor traffic was being turned away by police barricades. Fifty pickets—double the authorized number—were marching across from Town Hall between the Hotel Diplomat and Henry Miller's Theater. Some of their signs said, "America Do Not Believe the Red Liars" and "Dismantle Castro."

The student group was also screening everyone entering Town Hall with its own security force, led by Jacob Rosen, 24 years old, of 536 West 174th Street, who said he has been assisting racial integration efforts in Monroe, N.C.

Mr. Rosen said he had 150 men and women committee members at the doors and in the audience. They inspected pocketbooks and ran their hands over the pockets of those entering to make sure no "Molotov cocktails, stink bombs, or weapons of any kind" were being brought in.

Just before the meeting started, Mr. Rosen said he spotted about 30 anti-Castro sympathizers sitting in the back rows of the orchestra section. He said he asked them to leave and offered to refund their money. (Tickets had sold for \$1 and \$2.50 apiece.)

When the anti-Castro group protested, Mr. Rosen's committee members began hauling them out. In a melee, Rafael Alvarez, 28, of 168 State Street, Brooklyn, a member of the anti-Castro revolutionary recovery movement, was struck above the right eye. Blood streamed over his face, and four stitches were taken later at St. Clare's Hospital to close the wound.

#### BALCONY GROUP OUSTED

A few minutes later, Mr. Rosen's forces sought to eject from the balcony a group of members of the anti-Castro Cuban student directorate. Jose Antonio Lanuza, Miami chief of information for the group, asserted that 80 members had bought tickets at \$1 apiece but intended no disturbance.

"I'll give you 3 minutes to get out," Mr. Rosen said later he had told them, when the group became boisterous. The anti-Castro students started singing the Cuban national anthem and then poured down the stairs and out into the street, with their secretary general, Luis Fernandez Rocha, instructing his members to refrain from any disorder.

Corliss Lamont, writer and lecturer, served as chairman of the meeting after Carleton Beals, another writer, had asserted that announcements that he would take part were unauthorized. Mr. Lynn, a lawyer, acted as panel moderator after I. F. Stone, another writer, had withdrawn from the program.

Student speakers in a panel session included Mr. Luce, assistant editor of a monthly put out by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; Levi Laub and Steve Martinot, organizers of a Progressive Labor Movement club at Columbia University last year; Albert L. Maher, bearded former Harvard student and cowboy, whose father, John F. Maher is a wealthy Houston industrialist; John Wayne Thomas of Oakland, Calif., and Martin A. Nicolaus, of Fontana, Wis.

Other speakers included James Higgins, assistant editor of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, who helped take a collection for the students' legal defense, future trips and the family of one traveler who died in Cuba. Others were Maxwell Gelsmar and Truman Nelson, authors.

Mr. Lamont announced that the traveling students were accepting the challenge of the Cuban Student Directorate to a debate "on the proper occasion." He expressed the hope that Madison Square Garden might be the locale for the debate.

Mr. Luce declared that "we have broken no law, because there is no law" against travel to Cuba—only public regulations and notices.

Mr. Thomas said Premier Castro had ruled that "anyone who discriminates against any man is a counterrevolutionary and can be shot."

Mr. Laub said Cuba had "wonderfully honest leadership" but a "serious problem of bureaucracy." Mr. Martinot described Cuba's single-party system as "eliminating egotism which arises from the competitive system." Mr. Nicolaus asserted "the vast majority of the Cuban people backed Fidel Castro and the Socialist revolution."

While Mr. Maher was talking about folk culture in Cuba, a man dashed up on the stage to demand, "What about freedom to go out of the country?" Two guards hustled him away. Mr. Maher replied that "on the plane to Madrid a number of Cubans were leaving" and that when transportation became available, he was sure anybody who wished to leave could.

A heckler shouted from the balcony in Spanish and was also hastily ejected.

The rally was to end at 4:45 p.m., with the last part of the program consisting of written questions from the audience. But Mr. Rosen and other group leaders became worried about the departure of the throng, and, after vainly trying to charter a fleet of buses or taxis, arranged with the police for a guarded exodus to the subway.

At 4:23 p.m. Mr. Lamont interrupted to announce this move to the crowd. Ten minutes later, Mr. Rosen went to the stage to appeal to everyone to file out together, promising police and security guard protection.

Outside, mounted policemen and more than 100 dismounted but blue-helmeted policemen formed in rows to guard the crowd. Chief O'Connell said later he had sent for 75 extra motorcycle men at 2:45 p.m.

#### ANTI-CASTROITES SEALED OFF

By the hundreds, anti-Castro demonstrators were being walled off by the police at 44th Street, across the traffic island at Broadway and 43d Street, and south of 42d Street, with two blocks of Broadway barred to traffic.

Amid denunciations from the anti-Castro protestors, the Town Hall spectators made their way down a narrow stairway next to the New York City Information Center to the IRT and BMT subway lines. Only one woman change-collector was on hand to sell tokens; a police sergeant pitched in to help her until another collector arrived.

George Calvo, a 19-year-old Sunnyside, Queens, member of the Cuban Student Directorate, perched on shoulders of other anti-Castro demonstrators and through a microphone shouted to the police:

"American people, especially New York police, we think you have a right to tell your Government what you think. \* \* \* We would like to see the day you Americans and we the Cubans are fighting shoulder to shoulder against the Communist enemy \* \* \*. We don't want to fight you, your horses, the American people."

On 42d Street, individual Cubans implored policemen, "let's just get one or two beards." Patrolman William T. Walsh, 25, of the tactical patrol force, reported two anti-Castro demonstrators swung at him and injured his finger at Broadway and 42d Street.

The two were arrested and booked as Andre Mondros, 22, a painter, of 600 West 140th Street, and Roberto Villate, 29, a busboy, of 322 West 89th Street. They were charged with felonious assault, disorderly conduct and resisting arrest.

Earlier, the police had arrested Fred Jerome of 69 East Seventh Street, editor of the monthly periodical of the Progressive Labor Movement, on a charge of felonious assault in the injury to Mr. Alvarez. Two anti-Castro demonstrators charged they had seen Mr. Jerome hit Mr. Alvarez as he was being ejected from Town Hall. Mr. Jerome insisted he was a block away at the time.

Two other anti-Castro demonstrators were arrested on simple assault charges filed by two men after altercations at 43d Street and the Avenue of the Americas. They were booked as Osmundo Rodriguez, 32, of 561 West 143d Street, and Bernard Leon, 49, of 11-31 79th Street, Long Island City, Queens.

Nevertheless the 1,400 Town Hall participants made their way without incident aboard subway trains from the Times Square station, and by 5 p.m. the station was back to its normal air. On the street, policemen began dispersing the last anti-Castro demonstrators. The Paramount Theater movie marquee might have made a fitting caption. It read: "A Ticklish Affair."

#### STUDENTS WHO TRAVELED TO CUBA ILLEGALLY MADE ANTI-AMERICAN REMARKS IN CUBAN TRANSLATIONS FROM CUBAN NEWSPAPERS

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, upon my request of some weeks ago, the State Department sent me the translations of newspaper accounts, appearing in Cuban newspapers, of the 59 American beatniks who ventured to Cuba and of some of their anti-American, pro-Castro statements. Because of the timeliness of this subject, and the recent reprehensible conduct of many of these people and their followers during the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I am asking that these reports be placed in the Record.

I am also renewing my request that the cell leaders of this unrepresentative group of American young people be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Failure to do so will merely encourage further disrespect for U.S. laws and further undermining of our anti-Communist efforts in this hemisphere.

The translations, which speak for themselves, follow:

tween Canada and Russia, \$33 million tification of its routes south of New York. manner with the time allotted to it,

16436

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 18

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
DIVISION OF LANGUAGE SERVICES.  
(Source: Hoy, July 3, 1963, p. 1)

"Fidel met with the students from the United States at Varadero. He chatted at length and played ping-pong with them. Fidel made a great impression on all the students."

VARADERO, July 2 (by Reinaldo Pefialver Moral, of Prensa Latina).—The Prime Minister, Maj. Fidel Castro, chatted at length today in this summer resort with the group of American students who traveled to Cuba in order "to get to know the Cuban situation at close range."

The young students—totaling 59—are lodged at the Hotel International at this beach, where they have been enjoying a rest since their arrival in Cuba 3 days ago, defying the threats and obstacles placed in their way by the U.S. Department of State in order to prevent the trip.

The supreme leader of the Cuban revolution, who unexpectedly arrived at the hotel, had a pleasant chat with the visitors and later engaged in interesting games of ping-pong with them, four of whom he defeated.

Before leaving, Fidel Castro suggested to the American students that they should tour the interior of the country extensively and promised to meet them again in order to converse and exchange views.

He also congratulated them on the firm decision to which they held when they received the call from the Yankee NBC broadcasting station.

VARADERO, (by Benito, special correspondent).—With regard to the news that reached Havana about the threat by the U.S. authorities to cancel the passports of the 59 students and to take other coercive measures, Levi Loud, an American student who heads the large group, stated that such threats did not worry them and they would continue on their "historic trip through the island of Cuba."

Furthermore, in connection with the visit paid by the Prime Minister to the Hotel International at Varadero, the leader of the American group stated that "Fidel is an extraordinary man, completely different from the way the press depicts him."

The Minister of Economy, Regino Boti, and the Director of INDER José Lianusa, spent all of yesterday afternoon and evening with the 59 American students who are lodged at the Hotel International at Varadero, and answered many questions on certain aspects of the revolution formulated by the American students.

Likewise, José Rebelión, Joaquín Más, Maximino González, and Daniel Inclán, the leaders of the Federation of University Students, accompanied by Captain Fernando Ravelo, a member of the National Committee of the UJC, were exchanging views with the American students.

[Caption under the picture: "Fidel plays ping-pong with a young American."]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
DIVISION OF LANGUAGE SERVICES.  
(Source: Hoy, Habana, July 3, 1963, p. 8)

NEW YORK TIMES ADVOCATES TEARING DOWN THE WALL ERECTED AGAINST CUBA

"Although the Imperialist newspaper condemns the trip of the students, it says that it is a mistake to prevent trips to the island."

NEW YORK, July 2.—The New York Times comes out today in favor of having the United States tear down the wall prohibiting American citizens from traveling freely to Cuba.

The editorial, however, comments adversely on the decision of 59 students from American universities to travel to Cuba in spite of the threats of the Department of State.

The New York Times states that the 59 students "broke a Government regulation" and that "they will have no right to com-

plain" when they are condemned upon their return to the country, but it points out that the prohibition against visiting Habana is "a mistake."

Then it rejects the two so-called official arguments for preventing Americans from traveling to Habana:

(1) That there is no U.S. Embassy in Cuba; and (2) that after visiting Habana Americans "lend themselves to Cuban propaganda."

The editorial defends the theory that the United States ought to be better informed about Cuba. "If travel to Cuba were open to all Americans," it emphasizes, "the picture the United States would get \* \* \* would be varied, rounded, and honest."

The New York Times also asks: "If the Castro revolution is mostly bad, as most of us believe, why not trust intelligent adults to find this out for themselves?"

Lastly, in connection with the prohibition against the trips, the American newspaper suggests a criticism of President John F. Kennedy by recalling that on June 25 in West Berlin he stated that "we have never had to put up a wall to keep our people in, to prevent them from leaving us."

NEW YORK, July 2.—Rose S. Rosenberg, a Los Angeles lawyer, today ironically asked the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives to devote themselves to investigating "what is happening in the South" instead of engaging in "witch hunts."

Dr. Rosenberg was the first person who appeared before the House committee which today began hearings on trips to Cuba.

While the session was being held in the Federal building at the civic center about a hundred persons were displaying signs in the adjoining streets reading "Get Rid of the Witch Hunters."

Dr. Rosenberg was interrogated for an hour but she took refuge behind the 1st, 5th, 9th, and 10th amendments of the U.S. Constitution.

Rose S. Rosenberg traveled to Cuba in the spring of last year and, it was said, negotiated in Los Angeles to have medicines sent to Cuba.

[From Revolución, July 1, 1963]

(First part of article, on p. 1 of the paper, missing; this is the continuation, on p. 4 of the paper.)

(Headline: "Arrival of a group of \* \* \*") To Revolución by Levi Laub, a young student at Columbia University, New York, on arriving in Havana yesterday, heading the American student delegation that is visiting our country at the invitation of the FEU (University Students Federation).

As is already known, a group of 59 students and graduates of various universities of the United States was invited by the University Students Federation to visit Cuba last December, but they were unable to come because of the pressure of the Yankee Department of State, which not only threatened them with 5 years in jail or fines of \$5,000, or both, if they made the trip, but also indirectly blocked the possibility of the group's being able to travel by way of Canada.

Steadfast in their idea of getting face to face with the truth about Cuba, and resisting all threats, these young people of both sexes and extremely varied racial origin—Negroes, Jews, Puerto Ricans, white Americans—and of different political persuasions, left New York on June 25 last for Paris, the first stop on their trip to Cuba.

"In Amsterdam and Prague," José María Lima, a Puerto Rican who has just been graduated with a degree in mathematics from the University of California, told us, "we were approached by officials of the American Embassies in the Netherlands and Czechoslovakia, who in solemn official language warned us of the grave penalties to which we would be liable if we continued with our project. I am a Socialist by conviction. In my coun-

try I have fought in the ranks of those who want independence, because I believe that independence from the Yankee yoke is the only path open to Puerto Rico. A month ago I learned about the trip to Cuba that was being organized by the Permanent Students Committee on Trips to Cuba, and I gave notice of my intention to participate in the excursion. And here I am, anxious to submerge myself in the Cuban revolution."

The group includes students and graduates of the Universities of Columbia, Harvard, Wesleyan, Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, California, San Francisco, New York City College, Oakland City College, and other lesser schools in the United States.

They were met at the José Martí Airport by representatives of the foreign affairs section of the FEU and the Cuban Institute of Friendship Among Peoples.

Levi Laub, leader of the delegation, told the reporter about all the inconveniences that had preceded their arrival in Havana: "We left New York on Tuesday, June 25," he said, "bound for Paris, and we made stops in London and Amsterdam. As if it were an order from our Department of State, we were threatened in the three places by consular officials of the United States."

"Our passports were withdrawn for a number of hours," continued Laub, "and finally a long list was read to us, stating our supposed violations of the law by visiting Cuba. In Prague the same thing happened. The consul received us at the airport and gave us the familiar warning: 'This is going to cost you a jail sentence.'"

Levi did not look tired despite the long journey. His companions also appeared smiling and animated. The newspaper interview continued for more than half an hour through the immigration and customs sections of the airport. Our colleague, Tomás Toledo, who had accompanied them aboard the Britannia on the flight from Prague, putting together his impressions, which we print here, was surprised at the group's perfect cohesion, despite the fact that the majority of them had become personally acquainted with each other only when they assembled in New York on the 25th.

"We are not a political group; we are students, of various beliefs, and each of us is going to draw his own conclusions from this visit," Laub added. "As our fellow citizen, Stanton Evans, wrote in his book, 'Revelation en el Recinto Universitario' ['Revelation in the University Precincts'], 'We are not sponges absorbing ideological juices.' We simply aspire to be molders of opinion."

Levi further commented that they were certain that they were going to like Cuba and that they hoped to interview Fidel Castro and other leaders of the revolution, as well as the American Negro leader, Robert Williams, an exile in Cuba, a refugee from the racial terror of his own country.

There are 10 Negroes in the group; this is particularly important to the United States because of the fact that these students are visiting Cuba, where the revolution has eradicated odious racial discrimination.

"I FEEL HAPPY IN CUBA"

Philip Abbot Luce is another one of the students who are visiting us. Furthermore, he works for the National Guardian, a weekly publication, and the daily York Pennsylvanian.

"After having wanted to come for a long time, at last I am in Cuba," he exclaimed. "As for the threats that hang over us on our return to the United States, I say simply that they do not frighten me."

"THE FUTURE LIES IN SOCIALISM"

John Milton has firm convictions: "I believe that this journey will serve to confirm my conviction that the future lies in socialism," stated the young student from the University of San Francisco. "One can



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16437

see a new spirit in the Socialist countries. Men are looked upon as men, not as things." Marcus Gordon is studying painting in New York. "This trip is something I have long dreamed of and desired, and now I am here," he said to Revolution. "This makes me very happy. Aside from the program that we have laid out in order to see as much as we possibly can of Cuba, I am especially interested in getting in touch with Cuban painters."

**"FIDEL IS WONDERFUL"**

Richard Thorne is a robust Negro student from the University of California.

"Even without having visited Cuba," he said, "I had a very friendly feeling toward you. Fidel has accomplished something marvelous, not only in the elimination of the remains of racial discrimination but in the fact that with a small country he has the moral force, that is missing in the Government of the United States. Thus he can denounce the ruling classes of my country without fear. He represents the power of the people."

Referring to the racial crisis in the United States, he said:

"The leaders of this crusade, Wyatt Walker, Martin Luther King, and Ralph Abernathy, are very fearless, valiant men, and so are the people who participate every day in the street demonstrations. The Negro student leaders have also been characterized by their courage and bravery in this campaign, which has inspired solidarity among the people."

"But we must recognize," he concluded, "that they do have the weakness of fearing that they may offend the group from whom they are demanding the freedom that is denied to them in the United States."

"They have no right to prohibit us from traveling."

Marcia Glenn, a graduate of the University of Indiana, who specialized in Latin American civilization, was trenchant in her comments: "I am not in the least concerned about what the Government of the United States may do to me. They have no right whatever to keep from coming to Cuba. I consider myself very fortunate to have this opportunity to learn about this country and its revolution. I am very excited about the trip."

**A FIRM ATTITUDE**

We noted an air of determination in all the members of the delegation.

To sum up their firm attitude in the face of the campaign of intimidation by the State Department, it is sufficient to quote a paragraph from the official statement prepared by the group:

"We are traveling to Cuba despite the press communiques of the State Department attempting to limit the travel of American citizens, because we believe that it is our right to travel where we wish and when we wish."

# RECENTLY SIGNED WHEAT AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND RUSSIA EVIDENCES THAT THE ADMINISTRATION IS ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH IN COMBATING CASTRO'S COMMUNISM

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, another example of the Kennedy administration being asleep at the switch with respect to the Communist challenge in this hemisphere is best evidenced by the failure of the administration to protest the recent \$500 million wheat agreement between Canada and Russia, \$33 million

of which will be shipped directly from Canada to Communist Cuba.

Recent press reports indicate that the Government of Canada itself stated that the U.S. Government had been informed of these negotiations and that the Canadian Government had received no protest.

Mr. Speaker, the administration should register a formal protest and should have done it a long time ago. It is time for this Government to call for a halt to the trade agreements which will help sustain the Castro government.

It is about time this administration started exerting some leadership in this area. It is about time that the nebulous New Frontier withdrew its head from the clouds and took a good, hard look at the results of its anemic policies on Cuba.

While we are asking Latin American nations to stop trading with Cuba, it makes little sense to them—and also our other allies—to, at the same time, timidly acquiesce to trade being carried on between Cuba and our so-called allies to the north.

This double standard makes us look weak and foolish to those Latin nations that have joined us in this economic embargo of Cuba. It raises serious questions as to our sincerity in trying to rid this hemisphere of communism.

Mr. Speaker, this fiasco indicates further that there is little chance for any meaningful action in combating Castro communism in this hemisphere by this administration, and this includes the President's refusal to use his discretionary authority to withhold aid to nations who are trading with Cuba, recently rewritten into the foreign aid authorization bill on the floor of the House.

The manner in which this discretion is not being exercised relating this wheat deal proves again the necessity of Congress approving my amendment removing such discretion in cases of withholding aid to countries trading with Castro as I offered to the AID authorization bill.

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. VANIK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

# CAB PETITIONED FOR RECONSIDERATION OF AUGUST 15 DECISION

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the majority membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board once again has acted in the pattern that has been made clear in their Northeast Airlines New York-Florida decision; that is, one of harsh and preconceived judgment.

On Thursday of last week the Department of Justice filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board a petition for leave to intervene in the New York-Florida renewal case which involves the application of Northeast Airlines for permanent certification of its routes south of New York.

At the same time, the Justice Department filed a petition for reconsideration by the Board of its August 15, 1963, decision. The Justice Department's brief was well documented, thoughtful, and presented to the Civil Aeronautics Board the public interest point of view, which by congressional mandate is the Civil Aeronautics Board's function to protect. The thrust of the Justice Department's argument for reconsideration was that the Civil Aeronautics Board has disregarded long-established policy with respect to competition in major traffic markets and the Board's holding that only two carriers were needed in the New England-Florida market was contrary to the clear intent of Congress in the language of the Federal Aviation Act and established antitrust principles.

The brief of the Justice Department noted that the increase in the east coast-Florida traffic since the Civil Aeronautics Board allowed Northeast to participate therein was greater than the total traffic in which three carriers share in the Chicago-Miami market. It pointed out that the share of the Boston-Miami run carried by Northeast Airlines in 1962, almost 98 million passenger miles, was greater than that shared by three airlines between Chicago-Tampa, Chicago-Atlanta, and New York-Birmingham. After setting forth comparative statistics of passenger traffic between various cities in the United States, the Justice Department concluded that it was clear on economic grounds alone that "if the New York-Miami pair does not require at least three carriers, there is not a market in the country that does."

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the clear and compelling reasons, listed in the Justice Department's brief, for reconsideration and argument of the New York-Florida renewal case:

The traffic statistics, the decisions of the clear intent of Congress, the firm policy of the Federal Aviation Act, all clearly demonstrate that the east coast-Florida market, one of the richest in terms of profits and the largest in terms of passengers, must be served by at least three carriers.

The Board's decision is based on a finding that Eastern and National can meet the present needs of the market. Using such a finding as a rationale for its decision is contrary to its enunciated policies of more than 20 years.

On Monday, the first business day after it had read the Justice Department brief, the Civil Aeronautics Board, in a curt one-paragraph order denied the Justice Department the right to intervene. The Board said, in essence, that the Department of Justice was late in seeking to intervene and had not shown good cause which would justify late intervention.

It would seem to me that the Civil Aeronautics Board acted with tremendous and unnecessary rapidity in handing out its decision in this matter. As we all know, the Justice Department is charged with the duty of preventing monopoly in trade and commerce within the United States and the 16-page brief that was filed with the CAB by the Justice Department could not have been digested and disposed of in a reasonable manner with the time allotted to it.

which amounted to just 1 working day. I would hope that one agency of the Government should feel incumbent to give serious weight to the indictment of its reasoning by a fellow agency, which is charged with the duty of protecting the public interest. In addition to being an affront to the Department of Justice, the CAB's action in giving a cursory brushoff to the Justice Department's brief is completely unsound from both a legal and a policy standpoint.

The Attorney General and Assistant Attorney General William H. Orrick, Jr., of the Justice Department are to be congratulated for their forthright action in this matter, and I would hope that their attention will continue to be riveted on this situation which seems to tend toward the growth of monopolistic service to the air traveling public of Massachusetts, New England, and the entire eastern seaboard.

#### MEXICAN BRACEROS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in connection with the proposal that Public Law 78, known as the bracero law, be extended. Dramatically, though tragically, last night in California 28 braceros died as a sort of underline or emphasis of some of the things that we have for years been trying to bring to the attention of the American conscience.

I was recently assailed by a Mexico City newspaper that quoted an anonymous official of the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs who was quoted anonymously for he did not have the courage, the honesty or forthrightness to identify himself. He attacked me in the newspaper by describing me as having made a demagogic expression concerning this law. I called Public Law 78 a slave labor law, and I reiterate that statement today.

It is a pathetic thing when the officials of a government do not have the courage nor the ability to defend even their own citizens and it is more pathetic when we in a free country do likewise for less reason. By the enactment of the revived type of indenture servitude which had been proscribed by the Congress in 1885, we have gone on record as saying that we will enter into Government agreements to protect this kind of servitude and guarantee certain things that we deny to our own native labor.

So the newspapers last night said "Twenty-six Mexicans Die as Train Hits Bus."

Let us look to see what is behind this story. Was it a bus? I have investigated, and I have found that this accident took place in the very county in California that has proclaimed the loudest indignation and protestation that these imported workers were being cared for, that they had all kinds of protection, that they had legal protection and sanctions as to safety in transportation, work hygiene, sanitary conditions, labor standards, and so forth.

Let us see about that. We checked and found the accident involved a truckload of braceros, not a busload, but a truckload.

What was this truck? It was a flatbed truck with four rows of benches, with a capacity of 69 passengers. This truck was hit by a train and wholly demolished. Twenty-eight are dead up to this point; 13 are critically injured, some of whom may be expected to die; yet that truck met the legal standards.

How many braceros have been killed like this? What are the full statistical facts, even as poorly garnered as they have been? In 1959 we know 16 were killed in Arizona in a bus crash; in 1960, throughout the United States, 52; 1961, 129 were killed; in 1962, 76 were killed; and in 1963, so far, 43, or a total of 316 are dead from all causes in the last 5 years.

These statistics are not exactly complete or completely accurate because these are those things that prompt the attention of people only through accidents such as the one reported in the newspapers last night and this morning.

I say that my witnesses have not been my own remarks uttered here on the floor. My witnesses are the 28 known dead and the many more who are maimed. This testimonial is more eloquent, I am sure, for men of conscience, that is. My reply to the newspaper reports that this Mexican Government official had criticized me for utterances I had made in the American Congress against Public Law 78 is, I just wonder what would be the expressions of the gentlemen who have been so adamant in their public expressions here if some American newspapers had criticized a Mexican congressman for utterances he had made on the failure of the Mexican Congress.

So my reply to those newspapers in Mexico City and my reply to that unknown, anonymous Mexican Foreign Minister, and my reply to my own native colleagues here, is the tragic death of 28 men whose only protection is the luck of destiny and fate that may dictate that when they have been used and worked they will be returned summarily to where they came from, unless they jump the contract, which about 10 percent do, and then it is up to the Immigration and Naturalization officials to try to locate them.

This is something that I have not heard as a third witness or from a third party. I have been from one end of Texas, where this labor has been used for 10 years, to the other. The facts have confirmed, not disaffirmed, what some of us have said.

In my State last year the Labor Department changed the minimum wage for braceros from 50 to 70 cents. The use of the braceros dropped 76 percent. These are the same people who were saying they had to have this labor, but they dropped 76 percent in its use. Where did they get the labor they said they had to have? Naturally, even at this wage they found they could get domestics.

I have testimonials and letters from the growers in the valley of Texas. I

have visited them in the valley. I have letters and telegrams and statements in which they say, "We have a surplus of domestic labor. We do not need the bracero. We used to use the braceros but we do not need them any longer."

I have been accused of attacking Public Law 78 merely from the selfish standpoint of protecting the domestic migratory worker, but may I say once again that this is one of the principal reasons but it is not the main and only and exclusive reason. My main reason is that we have sowed the wind and we are going to reap the whirlwind with this type of practice that crystallizes and encases and embalms this indentured labor practice.

I have talked to Mexican officials who work for the Mexican consulate in the United States and privately and personally and off the record, they tell me, "What can we do? Your Government controls Mexico. You say you need it. Our Government officials cooperate. We succumb to pressure. There is not much we can do. If you really want to put a stop to it and if you put a stop to the bracero law, then make sure that you enforce the law preventing illegal entry into the United States. But you do not do it and you never have."

What do we do? Mexico is close to the United States. One of them even made the remark, "This has been the bad luck of Mexico, that it has been so far from God and so close to the United States." These are the sentiments that you do not hear publicly. These are the utterances that you do not hear quoted. But a human being can tell the difference between being treated justly and being treated unjustly. Even a dog can differentiate between being kicked and being stumbled over. These people may be ignorant—and the overwhelming masses of the braceros are. They cannot speak English. They cannot read or write, but they are human beings and they can tell the difference.

I agree that even at 50 cents or 60 cents, if that amount were paid, in most instances even that agreement was not kept. And we cannot mollify our consciences and say that we have enforced this—yes, you have some who will and some who will not—but I am talking about the cases in which it is not enforced—and if you have these situations, these things are bound to come back to haunt us. And that tells us better than anything that I can say or argue back and forth—and the stark realities and the occurrences that we are confronted with daily tell us the facts better than anything I can say. So the bracero who comes here and earns even 50 cents or 60 cents is earning more than he can earn in the place that he comes from. But nobody argues that. That is not the point. But, oh, the men who say they love this laborer and who say that they really want to help him are the very ones that will not help him to come here in freedom. They do not want immigration. If we need the Mexican laborer, why not let him come here in freedom as our parents did and as a freeman

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16467

## FURTHER PERSONNEL INCREASES

The agency hasn't yet determined at what point its manpower requirements will level off, and further increases in personnel probably will be asked for fiscal 1965. The agency's work force stood at 29,000 on July 1 and probably will rise to about 32,000 by next June 30. Even without additional staff, appropriations and expenditures for personnel and operations probably will rise about 10 percent in fiscal 1965. The fiscal 1964 request was \$552 million and Congress authorized \$518 million.

The major factor in the agency's apparent ability to hold the line on its fiscal 1965 appropriations is a leveling off in the demands of its manned space flight program, accounting for about 70 percent of the agency's total budget. Planners calculate fiscal 1964 will represent the peak appropriations requirements for some segments of the manned space flight effort.

It isn't anticipated, for example, that appropriations requirements for the two-man Gemini spacecraft, under prime contract to McDonnell Aircraft Corp., will be as high as this fiscal year's \$306 million. It's also estimated that appropriations requirements for Project Apollo have reached or are nearing their peak. Prime contractors for Apollo are North American Aviation, Inc., and Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.

### MASSIVE CANADIAN WHEAT DEAL WITH U.S.S.R. HURTS CAUSE OF FREE WORLD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the newspapers disclosed that Canada had just closed the biggest wheat deal in history with the Soviet Union in an agreement to sell the Soviet Union \$500 million worth of wheat. Frankly, I was shocked and surprised by this agreement. The Soviet Union does not need additional wheat for its own consumption. It produces more than it needs. It has been in the past a wheat exporter, and it is still an exporter of wheat.

The Soviet Union will use this wheat to continue to have economic influence and domination over its satellites by using such wheat for export.

Thirty-three million dollars worth of that wheat—and this is firmly in the agreement—will go to Cuba; and the Soviet Union will be saved a great deal of freight cost by shipping it from Canada to Cuba instead of from Black Sea ports to Cuba.

From any standpoint, it seems to me, this is not good for the free world or the United States.

There is another article in the New York Times, on the following page, under the heading, "U.S. Hopes To Gain From Wheat Sale." It is true that we gain indirectly in our balance-of-payments situation, because the wheat was sold for gold. It is true that Canada is our best customer. It is true that there may be some benefit in opening up markets—the wish is there expressed—for our wheat in future years.

But it must be realized that whatever surcease from a hot war we may be able to achieve through the test ban treaty—and we all hope and pray to achieve it—we are in stern and strict economic competition with the Soviet Union. Khrushchev has said he intends to bury us, and he intends to do it.

This wheat deal is bound to help the economy of the Soviet Union as almost no other kind of assistance could.

The Soviet Union is suffering primarily because she has an inefficient farm economy. Almost half of her people work on the farm. This means that those people cannot be taken off the farms and put into factories. This wheat deal will be of great benefit to the Soviet economy. It will have a similar favorable effect on Castro's economy.

I hope this kind of agreement, which was reportedly not objected to in Washington, will be given far greater consideration, in all its implications, before this kind of an agreement is approved in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the following articles which were published in the New York Times of Tuesday: "Huge Wheat Sale Closed in Canada"; "U.S. Hopes To Gain From Wheat Sale"; "Soviet Crop Loss Estimated at 10 Percent," which appeared in today's New York Times; and "Khrushchev Calls Farms Wasteful."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1963]

#### HUGE WHEAT SALE CLOSED IN CANADA

(By Raymond Daniell)

OTTAWA, September 16.—Canada closed an agreement today to sell the Soviet Union nearly \$500 million worth of wheat, the largest sale of grain for delivery in 1 year ever transacted.

Cuba was a direct beneficiary. Of the total 198 million bushels in the agreement, 16.5 million bushels of wheat and flour worth \$33 million are for delivery by the Soviet Union to Cuba.

The only transaction comparable in size is a \$580 million foreign-aid sale of U.S. wheat to India. That agreement, to expire June 30, 1964, covered a 3-year period.

The agreement, the third between the two countries, calls for deliveries five times as large as those provided for under any previous agreement with the Soviet Union. The Soviet purchase is also larger by about 40 million bushels than the recent long-term purchase by Communist China of 187 million bushels.

#### UNITED STATES INFORMED

Mitchell Sharp, Minister of Trade and Commerce, who negotiated the agreement for Canada, said the United States had been informed that part of the wheat was to be delivered to Cuba and had offered no objections. The Soviet Union will be responsible for transporting the wheat, he said.

Recently, the Ontario Wheat-Marketing Board, acting on its own, sold 1.8 million bushels of wheat to a foreign buyer and it was reported that it was destined for Cuba. Canada has been selling skimmed milk powder to Cuba directly for some time.

Under the terms of the agreement signed today, Canada will deliver at its ports 5.3 million long tons or 198 million bushels of wheat and 575 million long tons or 29.5 million bushels of wheat flour by July 1964. From the ports, the Soviet Union has the responsibility of transporting the grain.

The agreement was signed by Mr. Sharp, and S. A. Borisov, Soviet First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, who has been here as head of a Soviet trade delegation for the last 2 weeks to negotiate the purchase.

The agreement provides for short-term, Government-guaranteed credit through July 1964. The Soviet Union has agreed to buy

500,000 long tons or 18.7 million bushels more wheat or flour in 1965. This would be worth about \$36 million, a relatively small amount, which it was said might be increased if the Soviet Union needs to supplement its own crop further.

It is understood that the Soviet Union is acting as an intermediary for Cuba because Havana lacks the dollars to buy wheat directly. The Soviet Union is understood to have accrued the necessary dollars through recent gold sales. Mr. Sharp noted that Canada insists on payment in dollars.

#### VOLUME SURPRISING

What is most surprising about the agreement is the volume of deliveries. Fulfillment of the commitment within a year will pose serious logistical problems, tax the capacity of Canadian flour mills and lower the reserve in Canadian granaries to about the safety level or less than 500,000 bushels.

Mr. Sharp said at a news conference that the agreement, coming after Canada's sale this summer of 187 million bushels of wheat to Communist China over a 3-year period, would not interfere with commitments to supply major markets in Britain, Europe, Japan, Asia, and elsewhere under the International Wheat Agreement.

It might, however, prevent Canada from carrying out her planned expansion of foreign aid to underdeveloped countries in the form of gifts of grain.

Canada, Mr. Sharp said, will not try to sell any more wheat this year. However, it is reported that a Polish delegation is coming to try to make additional purchase. Poland has bought Canadian wheat for several years.

Mr. Sharp said the Soviet delegation had made no secret of its intention to distribute some of the huge grain purchase among its satellites in Eastern Europe as well as in Cuba.

Mr. Borisov said in a statement, read in Russian and translated, that weather in the Soviet Union had adversely affected the Soviet wheat crop, forcing his country to buy from other countries. The Soviet Government has also bought substantial quantities of wheat from Australia.

Future purchases of wheat from Canada for delivery to Soviet ports near Canada could be "economically justified and proper," Mr. Borisov said. He declared that this would "depend on how much Canada is able to enlarge its purchases of Soviet goods." Because the economies of Canada and the Soviet Union are somewhat similar, any great expansion of Russian exports to this country is regarded as unlikely.

The wheat sale was made possible by the Export Credit Insurance Corporation, a Government body, which agreed to provide guarantees to a maximum of \$200 million at any one time. The sale was for 25 percent cash for each shipment, with one-third of the balance payable after 6, 12, and 18 months from the date of shipment.

The agreement is expected to set a record for wheat export in a single year. The Canadian Wheat Board, whose chairman, W. C. McNamara, took part in the negotiations, estimated that total exports this year would amount to 550 million bushels, against 386 million bushels in 1952-53, the best post-war year. Sales of 550 million bushels would represent foreign-exchange earnings of more than \$1 billion.

Wheat sales to Communist China and the Soviet Union will go a long way toward enabling Canada to cover its chronic imbalance of trade with the United States, running at the rate of about \$1 billion a year.

The wheat and flour purchased by the Soviet Union for delivery this year, including purchases outside the agreement, amount to 239 million bushels.

Because of the immense volume of grain movements to the ports in so short a time,



16468

N. R. Crump and Donald Gordon, presidents of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways, were consulted on the ability of their lines to handle the traffic. They expressed confidence that they could do so, although it would mean doubling the traffic.

Arrangements have been made, Mr. Sharp said, to speed the movement of grain carriers through the St. Lawrence Seaway for the time left in the ice-free season and from the time it reopens next spring.

Even if Canada is able to get the required amount of grain from the prairies to the ports on her east and west coasts, it was suggested that the Soviet Union might find trouble in getting ships to carry the cargoes to its own ports.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1963]  
UNITED STATES HOPES TO GAIN FROM WHEAT SALE

WASHINGTON, September 18.—U.S. agricultural officials speculated cautiously today that Canada's \$500 million sale of wheat to the Soviet Union might benefit American producers.

Any benefit, it was said, would come from Canada's leaving open some world markets and from the United States filling demands with dollar sales. Some officials said the United States could increase its wheat sales by more than 200 million bushels in the next year as a replacement for Canadian wheat. This could raise U.S. wheat exports to a record.

While farm officials speculated on possible benefits, officials at the State Department said the Soviet plan to send Canadian wheat to Cuba posed no issue between the United States and Canada.

The State Department officials said that wheat was in the category of food and that Washington had never prohibited the shipment of food and drugs to Cuba under Premier Fidel Castro. Traditionally, they said, the United States has acted on humanitarian grounds—even toward Communist China.

#### POLICY UNDER STUDY

Washington also wonders whether the Soviet purchase will spur the United States to open its surplus agricultural products to the Soviet Union and to other Communist countries.

There is no legal prohibition of government-to-government sales with the Soviet Union, provided that commercial exporters obtain export licenses from the Department of Commerce. The policy, however, has been to rule out trade in farm products with Communist countries other than Poland and Yugoslavia.

This issue has agitated Congress for several years. Congress has prohibited aid to any country known to be dominated by communism or Marxism. But it has permitted sales and gifts of surplus farm products where the President finds them in the national interest.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Democratic whip, asserted today that the United States must change its outdated export policies if it was to share in world markets.

Wheat is not a war material, he told the Senate in commenting on the Canadian-Russian agreement. Canada, he said, is getting dollars for its wheat at a time when the United States needs gold to help its dollar balance.

#### HODGES FAVORS EXPANSION

There was no official indication that the Soviet purchase had stimulated a re-examination of the U.S. policy. Earlier today Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges said he had planned to suggest to President Kennedy that the United States might expand trade with Communist countries in the wake of the easing of tensions and the treaty for a limited ban on nuclear tests.

Mr. Hodges spoke on the television program "Today" over the National Broadcasting Co. network before Canada announced the Soviet agreement. He did not specifically include farm products. The Secretary said, "We ought to follow somewhat more what our allies have been for the last several years—namely, to sell goods."

The Department of Commerce will hold a White House conference tomorrow on promoting exports. President Kennedy will speak, and Mr. Hodges said he planned to carry his plea to the President then.

Analysts of Soviet agriculture and the Department of Agriculture commented that the Canadian sale might indicate that the Russian grain shortage was worse than had been believed. But they had no definite word.

Agriculture officials indicated that if the United States could add to its exports, wheat prices would generally be strengthened. But, they pointed out, this applied to the current wheat crop and would have no effect on the 1964 crop.

#### PRICE DROP EXPECTED

Official predictions are that wheat prices will drop sharply next year. This is based on producers' rejection of the administration's tough new wheat-output control proposal earlier this year. That program would have guaranteed producers \$2 a bushel, compared with the predicted 1964 price of about \$1.30.

One cause of worry, officials said, is that with the Canadian sale opening sales for U.S. wheat, and with a resultant stiffening of prices, producers may be induced to plant more. Winter wheat, the bulk of the U.S. crop, is going into the ground now for harvest next year.

One reason for caution by farm officials is that Canada has had two successive bumper wheat crops. The 1962 production was 550 million bushels; this year's yield, estimated at 706 million could amount to 750 million.

Canada could easily handle the 550 million bushels for domestic and export needs, the officials said, but this year's crop provided her with a 200-million bushel surplus to be drained off by the Soviet Union. At the same time, they noted, Canada has notified some customers that she cannot fulfill all her commitments.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1963]  
SOVIET CROP LOSS ESTIMATED AT 10 PERCENT  
(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—U.S. specialists on Soviet agriculture and trade today ascribed Moscow's purchase of Canadian wheat to a drop of perhaps 10 percent in the Soviet crop.

A contract for the Russian purchase of more than 8 million metric tons of wheat and wheat flour was signed in Ottawa yesterday.

The purchase was necessary, the U.S. specialists said, because even in past years the Soviet crop has provided only slightly more than enough to meet consumer demands.

This year's drop, combined with the new needs of Cuba and Eastern Europe, left the Soviet Union with a substantial deficit.

Weather conditions were believed to be the main cause for the decrease in output.

The estimate here was that the Canadian purchase was the equivalent of about 1 month of Soviet domestic consumption. Officials warned that precise figures were not possible because Soviet export commitments are not fully known.

#### DEMANDS ON CROP SHOWN

The demands on the Soviet wheat crop, both domestic and international, were illustrated by Soviet insistence that the entire agreement be conditioned on Canada's acceptance of the shipment to Cuba of 465,000 metric tons of wheat and flour from the purchase.

Canada advised the United States of this condition when the State Department asked whether the deliveries to Cuba were an essential part of the transaction.

Figures for Soviet wheat and flour exports to Cuba indicated today that Moscow had decided to meet its pledges of wheat to Cuba through purchases of Canadian wheat.

This, experts here stressed, showed that the Soviet Union would rather pay in dollars for supplying Cuba with wheat and flour, now among the essential staples consumed on the island than take them out of her own supplies.

The Cuban wheat and flour needs grew from 292,000 metric tons in 1961 to the 465,000 tons this year, largely to make up for a drastic decrease in Cuban food production including rice, black beans, and mangu, a turnip-type edible root.

#### MOSCOW WILL SAVE

In overall terms, however, the Soviet Government is making a saving in buying the wheat for Cuba from Canada, because freight costs from Canada to Cuba are only a fraction of what Moscow pays for shipments from Black Sea ports.

#### ALLIES IN BLOC MAKE DEMANDS

In addition to the rising Cuban needs, the Soviet Union is known to be under pressure to provide wheat and grain in considerable quantities to its Eastern European allies, notably Poland and East Germany, because of their own crop failures, also caused by poor weather.

Even before the Soviet harvest shortages became known, Poland indicated her eagerness to obtain additional U.S. wheat on loan under the commodity surplus program and to purchase a sizable amount of wheat in Canada.

She had been receiving U.S. wheat and other farm commodities under the surplus program for the last 6 years, but she is reported to be having difficulty in opening negotiations with Washington.

Cuba, which ran out of foreign exchange in 1961, has been depending exclusively on Soviet shipments financed by credit arrangement. In an article in the June issue of U.R.S.S., a Soviet magazine in Spanish, a Soviet trade representative, P. Sakun, wrote that "the supply of bread to the Cuban population is carried out completely through the supply of Soviet wheat and flour."

What now appears to have been one of the first signs of Soviet difficulty in delivering wheat and flour to allies came in a broadcast by the Havana radio last month. The radio announced that the production of crackers and noodles would have to be curtailed temporarily.

U.S. specialists say that while the Soviet Union reported a wheat production of 70 million metric tons last year, the figure was probably closer to 55 million tons.

The size of the Canadian purchase indicates that the 1963 production will be less than 50 million tons.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1963]

#### KHRUSHCHEV CALLS FARMS WASTEFUL

Moscow, September 17.—Premier Khrushchev has demanded an all-out effort to "improve the management of Soviet agriculture."

Speaking in Volgograd yesterday to regional officials responsible for state farms and irrigation projects, the Premier chided "people who cling to their old habits and who cannot get rid of the bureaucratic style of management."

The speech was printed tonight in Izvestia, the government newspaper. It occupied the greater part of the paper's front page and almost an entire inside page.

The Premier stressed the questions of fertilizer and irrigation, both long of special interest to him.



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16469

He disclosed that the central committee of the Communist Party, after prolonged debate, had decided recently to create a new administration exclusively responsible for the construction and operation of all irrigation works in the country.

## OUTPUT TO BE INCREASED

Mr. Khrushchev also said the central committee had concluded that it was of prime national importance to increase the production of mineral fertilizer and to insure that existing stocks of fertilized were being used effectively.

"We must spare no effort to increase the production of fertilizer," Mr. Khrushchev added.

He said that present plans called for an increase of fertilizer production from 20 million tons this year to 29 million tons next year and to 35 million tons in 1965. The goal of 35 million tons is equal to the 1962 fertilizer output of the United States, Mr. Khrushchev noted.

The Premier cited the care with which American farmers protected their fertilizer in plastic bags in contrast with the neglectful practices in the Soviet Union, where, he said, piles of fertilizer were allowed to freeze for children to sledge down on.

Mr. Khrushchev also criticized the cost of vegetables, declaring that it was "a shame" that Soviet agriculture with its modern machinery had allowed the price of vegetables to rise so high.

Mr. Khrushchev said he was "not pleased" with what he had seen and heard in the newly irrigated Volga-Don region, which he inspected yesterday and where he made his speech.

"If you continue to work like this, then the bread received from such irrigated lands will become bitter because you spend a lot to produce it," he cautioned.

## YUGOSLAV FARMS PRAISED

Mr. Khrushchev said that during his recent visit to Yugoslavia he had been impressed by the high yields obtained on state farms there and by the effective use made of fertilizer.

Although state farms make up only 20 percent of the Yugoslav agricultural area, he said they produce 60 percent of the country's bread grain.

Mr. Khrushchev hinted that instead of extending the acreage under cultivation as in the past under his virgin lands plan, the Soviet Union would in the future concentrate on intensifying production on existing acreage, mostly through the wider use of fertilizer.

The Soviet leader said that on the average the Soviet Union was using 154 pounds of mineral fertilizer a hectare (2.47 acres) of arable land compared with 499 pounds in the United States, 1,115 in France, 1,685 in Britain, and more than 2,200 in West Germany.

"Comrade leaders," the Premier said, "it is necessary now to improve the management of agriculture in the most resolute way."

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, supplementing the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin regarding the sale of \$500 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union, it seems to me we must view it with mixed emotions.

So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it conclusively proves the failure of the Communist agricultural programs and demonstrates to the world what a poor farmer the Communist bloc is. As far as Canada is concerned, the sale is undoubtedly a good bargain and economically useful.

But insofar as this deal specifically includes, as the Senator from Wisconsin

pointed out, \$33 million worth of grain for Cuba, it involves a very serious breach in U.S. efforts for economic and political isolation of the Castro regime.

Canada has always refused to join the Organization of American States and participate in hemispheric planning efforts, but this move goes a step further than that. It is a direct repudiation of the efforts of the OAS to isolate Castro. It will invite leftists throughout the hemisphere to press for renewed ties with Castro and may open the way for an even greater flood of Communist influence into Latin America.

Furthermore, reports indicate that the Canadians have also been selling skim milk powder to Cuba for some time.

It is ironic that for some time the United States has tried to move carefully and restrict its Public Law 480 sales of grain, which represent a substantial and effective part of our foreign aid program in order not to offend nations like Canada. Our aid to underdeveloped countries, in other words, has been deliberately held down to please Canadian grain sellers. Yet, Canada has one of the smallest foreign-aid programs in the entire free-world. Proportionate to Canada's gross national product, the country supplies only one-fifth as much aid to poorer nations as the United States does and ranks practically at the bottom in free world aid programs.

Increased international trade is all very well and dollars are important to every nation. But I think it is extremely unfortunate that the Canadian Government, in its pursuit for profit, should deliberately flout the mutual interest of the entire hemisphere in encouraging a Soviet withdrawal from Cuba. In fact, what the Canadians have done is to strengthen the Soviet position in Cuba, by allowing the Soviets to take the credit for alleviating the food shortage.

This action, although on a larger scale dollarwise, is comparable to the intention of a French firm in Paris to sell Castro equipment to build a sugar-waste processing plant, by which waste sugar cane may be chemically processed into yeast. This undertaking, on which I have just received what I consider positive confirmation from Paris, will, like the grain sale, tighten the Communist grip on Cuba.

It is regrettable, and a sign of the half-hearted manner in which our own shipping and other restrictions have been applied, that there has been not one single word of protest or condemnation by our Government on these moves.

I did not know until the Senator from Wisconsin spoke that our State Department had actually approved of this sale. At least I know that there has been no protest or condemnation of it. I hope it is not indicative that there is no real will in Washington to enforce a strong boycott against Cuba, and that our Government is content to drift with the tide and roll with the punches that come, not only from the Communist bloc, but, alas, in increasing number from our allies.

I am greatly distressed by this transaction insofar as it represents a sale to Cuba, indirectly, and I share the concern

of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I have been following with considerable interest the statements being made on the wheat deal between Canada and the Soviet Union, with some of the wheat being shipped to Cuba.

It is a little surprising to me to hear a Member of the Senate state on the floor that this was done with the approval of the administration in Washington. I was always under the impression that Canada, being a sovereign nation, does what it does in its own best interest, as we do also.

While I certainly have my doubts and do not approve of the action with regard to Cuba, I point out that this matter is Canada's business, and Canada's business alone.

I would also point out, on the subject of wheat, that we have shipped a good deal of wheat to our friends in Western Europe, and that certain allegations have been made on the floor of the Senate, and certain proofs have been forthcoming, to the effect that some of the wheat which we shipped to our friends in Western Europe has, at times, has been milled and shipped behind the Iron Curtain.

Therefore I would suggest that we look at this matter with a little understanding. I do not approve of what Canada has done, but Canada, being a sovereign country, does what it desires, and what it does is not dependent upon approval in Washington. To the best of my knowledge there has been no approval in Washington of what Canada has done in connection with this wheat deal.

Mr. AIKEN. The colloquy we have been hearing in connection with the sale of Canadian wheat to Russia has been quite interesting. It is significant that, as the need for wheat in Communist China increased, our own exports increased materially. There is no use trying to fool ourselves. If any of the countries behind the Iron Curtain want American goods, they can get them, although they must go through a third country, which skims off the cream.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Usually they are our allies.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; our own allies. They are doing a land office business. I do not want to add to anyone's discontent, but I have just read that the Australians have sold \$100 million worth of wheat to Russia.

What is the solution? Shall we sever relations with Australia and Canada?

Instead of constantly complaining, we should make some suggestions about what to do about the situation. So far as I know, the only thing we can do is to break off diplomatic relations with Australia and Canada, and perhaps also with Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, and Italy, and all our other good friends.

I am satisfied that our friends are doing a land office business with Communist countries and taking a very substantial profit on the materials and production which we sell to them.

If Cuba wants to get powdered milk or flour from American wheat, it can get

it; so can Hungary and Rumania and Russia. To get it, of course, it must go through a third party.

Therefore, we ought to hear some recommendations as to what to do about the situation.

Certainly the U.S. Government does not have to approve Canadian transactions or Australian transactions with any other country. The only recourse would be retaliation. What form that retaliation should take, I do not know. The fact remains that our best friends are cleaning up on us, and we are taking it out on complaints.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The article published in the New York Times, which I read, states:

Mitchell Sharp, Minister of Trade and Commerce, who negotiated the agreement for Canada, said the United States had been informed that part of the wheat was to be delivered to Cuba and had offered no objections.

Another article published in yesterday's New York Times states:

While farm officials speculated on possible benefits, officials at the State Department said the Soviet plan to send Canadian wheat to Cuba posed no issue between the United States and Canada.

At least no objection was made by the U.S. Government, and certainly no reluctance was shown on our part toward having the deal go through. There was no protest. No reservation was expressed with regard to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Wisconsin ought to be fair. I know he wants to be fair. So far as the State Department is concerned, it has not been asked, and it should not be asked by the Canadians as to what they should or should not do. After all, Canada is a sovereign nation, as I have tried to indicate. What the Senator says does not indicate that the State Department had approved the wheat deal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I read again from yesterday's New York Times:

Mitchell Sharp, Minister of Trade and Commerce, who negotiated the agreement for Canada, said the United States had been informed that part of the wheat was to be delivered to Cuba, and had offered no objections.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What good would it have done?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We could at least have disagreed with it. We could have said we do not like it. We could at least have stated our position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Suppose they told us they did not like what we were doing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So long as they informed us, it seems to me that if the State Department did not like it, it could have said so. It is possible Canada might not proceed against our expressed opposition. If she did proceed, it would be possible for this country to consider steps that might discourage such action in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is Canada's business. That is the answer.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Canadians ship wheat from Canada to Cuba, it is less expensive than shipping it from Russia.

Last year our exports of wheat to western Europe increased tremendously, going above 100 million bushels. No doubt some of that was shipped to Red China.

It is cheaper to ship Canadian wheat to Cuba than to have it reshipped, and the same is true with respect to wheat shipped to Red China, or to any other part of the world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The point I wish to make is that we should try to make it as expensive, difficult, and onerous for the Communist nations as possible, not as easy and convenient as we can make it.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wisconsin recommend that the United States sever diplomatic relations with Canada, Australia, France, West Germany, and Belgium?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly not; I say we should have protested and made our position clear.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator think we should tell Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other nations how to conduct their business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say that when Canada informs us that she plans to sell to Russia wheat that Russia will send to Cuba, we should say we oppose that action because it is a bad thing to do. Our allies can do it; they are sovereign nations. But we should at least make our position clear to them; that is all I ask.

Mr. AIKEN. They will go ahead and ship it anyway.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why assume this great nation is so impotent? This way they do it with our tacit approval.

Mr. AIKEN. Even if we should say, "No," very few countries would do what we ask. Even Vietnam would not do what we want it to do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We can hardly blame or criticize our allies for assisting the Communist bloc if our State Department, which is informed of these actions, does not at least go on record disapproving them. If Canada takes such action, as it has done, without notifying our Government, or does it over the protest of our Government, we should criticize Canada. But when Canada informs us, and our State Department indicates no objection, the criticism and it should be emphatic should be lodged with the State Department, not with Canada.

#### A FLOWER FOR THEIR GRAVES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last night's Washington Evening Star contained three interrelated items on the disgraceful and loathsome happenings in Birmingham, Ala., where repeated bombings and now the killings of innocent children while attending Sunday School in their church have put the spotlight on the too-long delayed struggle for equal rights for all the people of the United States regardless of the color of their skin.

The first article, written by columnist David Lawrence, urges the Negro to go slow—not to push things too fast. It occurs to me that Mr. Lawrence should ask himself whether if he were born a Negro he would consider it pushing too fast if, 100 years after he had been promised equality and was still being

denied equal educational opportunities, equal employment opportunities, equal accommodations, he too would think it was pushing things too far to want these constitutionally guaranteed rights—now.

The second item is an editorial in the same issue of the Star disagreeing with Mr. Lawrence. I agree with that editorial. I agree with its view that Mr. Lawrence's comments are "tasteless and absurd." In the light of what has been happening in Birmingham, as the Star says editorially "this is a time for shame, not for self-righteousness."

Finally, a column from the Atlanta Constitution, written by its editor, Eugene Patterson, a native Georgian, entitled "A Flower for the Graves," tells eloquently what should be in the hearts of all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that these three items be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 17, 1963]

ANSWERING BIRMINGHAM BOMBERS—ALL SIDES URGED TO WORK OUT REFORMS AND PUT THEM INTO CITY ORDINANCES

(By David Lawrence)

The tragedy of Birmingham reflects the conflicts of angry men. It emphasizes a defeat for the rule of reason and a triumph for the spirit of mobocracy.

To preach nonviolence, yet to sanction street demonstrations which incite to violence, is to stir up the deepest emotions. Under such circumstances, men on both sides tend to feel rather than to think.

Responsibility for the recent outbreaks of violence will be attributed by each side to the other in the integration controversy. It will be said that, if the churches themselves had not become active participants in the public demonstrations, there would have been less resentment in the communities. It will be argued in reply that there was no other way to dramatize what was felt to be an innate injustice, both in law and morality.

There is no question about the fact that the bitterness of those who have been discriminated against because of race or color produces an anger that often brushes aside pleas for a rule of reason and for the operation of a system of law. Not so many years ago, the anger of the mob caused the lynching of many an innocent man. The mob always felt sure that the suspect was guilty and cried out: "Why wait for the courts—he's guilty." The cry today is: "Why wait for the process of law—it's too slow."

The air is filled with threats. It is being said that, unless this or that reform is immediately granted, there will be race violence. No constructive purpose is served by such threats and, when uttered by clergymen, they are even more discouraging. For what is lacking in the controversies today is the restraint that comes from a true religious spirit. Saint Thomas Aquinas in his famous book said:

"The angry man is energetic in the pursuit of justice. But anger can destroy the reasonableness and prudence of our actions. Frequently angry men exact a greater vengeance than the injury done to them merits."

This applies particularly to the men who bombed the Negro church in Birmingham. They do not represent or reflect a majority sentiment in the community. They gave vent only to their own passions of anger, and their evil deed will bring about an ad-